

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bearden et al in view of Tholome (and Allison et al?) Applicants' invention provides a method for allowing electric sprayers to operate efficiently in such a way that performance is slightly reduced while maintaining spraying in the event the motor should reach an elevated temperature. Applicants' invention as defined in claim 1 allows the unit to continue spraying but at a controlled reduced pressure level which will reduce the temperature of the unit. There is no suggestion in any of the cited references of record to this controlled pressure stepdown (to a non-zero level) in response to attainment of a predetermined temperature to allow continued spraying.

Bearden reduces the speed of the motor in response to an over-temperature condition rather than the controlled pressure. When Applicants' invention reduces the controlled pressure, the speed of the sprayer may not be reduced at all depending on the flow and load.

Tholome does nothing more than shut down the sprayer when a thermal limit is reached – typical of most sprayers and an undesirable construction which does not allow continued spraying until the unit cools off.

In particular, Allison is a high pressure water blaster/sprayer that is not designed for spraying abrasive materials (abrasives are injected downstream of the pump (col. 1, lines 40-45) and senses the temperature of the oil not the electric motor as claimed, shutting off the motor when the high temperature has been reached.

Appl.No. 10/575,607
Amdt.dated January 20, 2011
Reply to Office action of October 20, 2010

Even if the cited references were properly combined (and there is no reason why one skilled in the art would combine a water cutter with a downhole submersible pump and a paint sprayer other than Applicants' disclosure) the claimed limitations would not be met – namely a variable speed paint sprayer which reduces the control pressure in response to a temperature condition.

Claim 2 is respectfully submitted to be patentable for the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1 and additionally for the limitations set forth therein. Baer does not disclose the time delay claimed.

The rejection of claim 3 has similar defects and additionally does not show changing to on/off (deadband) control to a non-zero pressure in response to a temperature condition.

Similarly, claims 6 and 7 are respectfully submitted to be patentable for the reasons set forth with respect to claim 5 and additionally for the limitations set forth therein.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 have also been amended to make clearer the already stated antecedent basis.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application as amended patentably distinguishes over the rejection of record

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

/dbf/

Douglas B. Farrow

Registration No. 28582

Graco Inc.

Appl.No. 10/575,607
Amdt.dated January 20, 2011
Reply to Office action of October 20, 2010

PO Box 1441
Minneapolis, MN 55440
(612) 623-6769
pto@graco.com